THE HON'BLE Ms. JUSTICE G. ROHINI

WRIT PETITION No.12736 OF 1998

ORAL ORDER:

The petitioner is working as a conductor in the A.P. State Road Transport Corporation. In response to the recruitment notification dated 23.5.1996, inviting applications for recruitment to the posts of Officer Under Training (Technical & General), the petitioner applied for the post of Officer Under Training (General). It is stated that he belongs to 'OC' category and satisfied the prescribed eligibility criteria. Having applied through proper channel, he appeared for the test conducted on 5.10.1997. However, he was not selected. Aggrieved by the same, this writ petition was filed on 28.4.1998, alleging that the 1st respondent-Corporation committed several irregularities in conducting recruitment test, and accordingly, seeking a direction to set aside the results announced pursuant to the recruitment test held on 5.10.1997.

Though the petitioner sought stay of interview scheduled on 15.4.1998 and 16.4.1998, no such interim relief was granted. The learned counsel for the petitioner did not dispute the fact that as of today the selected candidates were already appointed.

Be that as it may, coming to the merits of the case, it is to be noted that the contention of the petitioner is that 30% women reservation cannot be implemented in the absence of any specific policy to the said effect. The said ground does not stand scrutiny, since the State Government has already provided 33.33% reservation for women, and the same is being implemented by the Corporation also.

The further contention raised by the petitioner is that the ratio followed by the Corporation in calling candidates for interview was erroneous. It is stated that there is absolutely no basis for the ratio adopted by the 1st respondent-Corporation i.e., inviting 54 candidates as against 22 posts which is neither in the ratio of 1:2 or 1:3. The

petitioner contended that the ratio adopted by the 1st respondent-Corporation is irrational and whimsical.

The 1st respondent-Corporation in the counter-affidavit stated that against 26 posts of OUT (General), 55 candidates were invited, and as against 30 posts of OUT (Technical), 57 candidates were called for interview. The candidates who secured equal marks on par with the last candidate were also called for interview. The short fall of candidates in OUT (Technical) was only due to non-availability of women candidates against the posts reserved for them.

In the light of the explanation offered by the respondents in the counter-affidavit, I do not find any substance in the contention raised by the petitioner. N o *mala fides* were alleged against any of the respondents and the ratio adopted was not in violation of any statutory provision.

Even with regard to the alleged lapses in valuation of answer sheets, the respondents have explained that the answer sheets containing hall ticket numbers were detached and they were given separate code numbers to avoid malpractice.

In the circumstances, the allegations made by the petitioner cannot be accepted and absolutely no ground is made out to set aside the recruitment already made.

The writ petition is accordingly, dismissed. No costs.

_____

(G. ROHINI, J.)

12th July, 2006.
Kgr

THE HON'BLE Ms. JUSTICE G. ROHINI

WRIT PETITION No.12736 OF 1998

12th July, 2006.

Between:
K. Ramesh Gupta. .. Petitioner.

And

A.P.S.R.T.C. represented by
Vice Chairman & Managing Director,
Musheerabad, Hyderabad and another. ..Respondents.